



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,916	03/07/2007	Lambertus A. De Kleine	1321-114 PCT US	8679
28249	7590	09/11/2008	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. SUITE 702 UNIONDALE, NY 11553				NWAONICHA, CHUKWUMA O
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1621		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
		09/11/2008		
		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/582,916	DE KLEINE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHUKWUMA O. NWAONICHA	1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Current Status

1. This action is responsive to Applicants' amendment of 15 May 2008.
2. Receipt and entry of Applicants' amendment is acknowledged.
3. Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are pending in the application.

The 102 rejection of claims 11 and 12 is withdrawn following Applicants amendment.

The 103 rejection of claims 1-10 and 13-21 is maintained for the reason stated in the previous Office Action dated 11/28/2007.

Applicants' arguments filed 15 May 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because Applicants claimed process comprising the steps of reacting a dichloromonophenyl phosphate and monochlorodiphenyl phosphate with an aliphatic alcohol to form mixed phosphate ester is obvious in view of the teachings of Hardy, Sr. et al. and Giolito et al. because the prior art references cited teach the elements of the claimed invention with sufficient guidance, particularity, and with a reasonable expectation of success, that the invention would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants argue that the process of Hardy, Sr. et al. and Giolito et al. were carried out at a lower temperature. The argument is not convincing because the prior art of Hardy, Sr. et al. teach a temperature of 40-100°C. See column 2, lines 27-42 of US 4,034,023. Additionally, merely modifying the process conditions such as temperature and concentration is not a patentable modification absent a showing of criticality. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 U. S. P. Q. 233 (C. C. P. A. 1955). Therefore,

the instantly claimed invention would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants argue that their process produce unexpected result calculated reaction yield (upon adding TTP, 2-ethylhexyldiphenyl phosphate and 2-ethylhexylphenyl phosphate) of 94.4% and 97.4% respectively, that in stark contrast, the reaction process recited in Hardy conducted at a temperature below 35°C, so as to avoid by-product, has a yield of 77% and 82%. However, Applicants failed to provide a side-by-side comparison of the product yield of their process and that of the prior art process at the same reaction temperature and concentration. The examiner is respectfully requesting that applicants provide a data of a side-by-side comparison of Applicants process and that of the prior art process. This submission of this data would make Applicants' argument convincing.

New Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are rejected because the claims recite "a process comprising" and "a two-step process". See claim 1, line 1, claims 5-8, line 1 of the

claims and claims 17-20, line 1 of the claims. It is not clear what process or what two-step process Applicants are claiming. Clarification is required.

Claim Objection

The amendment to claims 13 and 21 filed 15 May 2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the following phrase added new matters to the specification; "a process for plasticizing, lubricating and/or flame retarding a polymeric material". This process is neither taught nor disclosure in the specification. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha whose telephone number is 571-272-2908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha/
Examiner, Art Unit 1621

/Karl J. Puttlitz/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621, for

Daniel Sullivan
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Technology Center 1600